

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 22-25 remain in the application. Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks to follow is requested.

Claims 1-4 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Respectfully, the Examiner fails to understand the disclosure and states that it is unclear how an intermediate layer, formed by galvanoplastic joining technique, can possibly be located between the individual optical elements (mirrors) and the basic body when the individual optical mirror elements (mirrors) are positioned on the basic body due to the fact that the galvanoplastic technique would appear to substantially cover all of the exterior surfaces except for the interface between the individual optical element mirror (mirrors) and the basic body (pg. 2 of paper no. 15).

First, the Examiner is correct that no intermediate layer 10 is formed between the interface of the individual optical element mirror (mirrors) and the basic body. Figure 2 (now deleted) of the originally-filed application illustrated **the intermediate layer laterally beside the optical elements and on the basic body 8**. To more clearly illustrate this, Figure 2 is deleted and Figures 2a and 2b are added. No new matter is added as is more thoroughly discussed below.

In the context of enablement commensurate in scope with the claims, the Examiner is respectfully reminded that the Federal Circuit has repeatedly held that “the specification must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without ‘undue experimentation’” *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); MPEP §2164.08 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Nevertheless, not everything necessary to practice the invention need be disclosed. MPEP §2164.08 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.). In fact, what is well-known is best omitted. *In re Buchner*, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991); MPEP §2164.08 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.). All that is necessary is that one skilled in the art be able to practice the claimed invention, given the level of knowledge and skill in the art. MPEP §2164.08 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.).

Pursuant to this authority, given the level of knowledge and skill in the art, the originally-filed drawings and specification would be understood by one skilled in the art of **galvanoplastic processing**, and the questions raised by the Examiner would not be an issue raised by one skilled in the art. As stated in the originally-filed application at paragraph 23 on page 6, galvanoplastic processes are generally known, for which reason they are not discussed in any more detail here. However, to facilitate the Examiner’s understanding, new figures 2a and 2b are presented to more thoroughly describe the galvanoplastic processing for the Examiner’s benefit. However, it should be clearly understood, that these drawings are not needed for one skilled in the art, and therefore, no new matter is added. The originally-filed application does enable one skilled


in the art to make or use the invention. The 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Since no other rejections are presented against the pending claims, claims 1-4 and 22-25 are allowable.

This application is now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2-23-04

By:   
D. Brent Kenady  
Reg. No. 40,045



ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES

2/2




Fig. 2

*Added Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b*




Fig. 3




Fig. 4